

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-19 remain in the case.

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Ketwich, of record, in view of the U.S. Patent to Bisset et al. ("Bisset") No. 5,543,588; claims 4, 5, and 19 stand rejected under Section 103(a) further on the patent to Armstrong, of record; and claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under Section 103(a) further on the patent to Zenk, of record. All three rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, applicant wishes to remind the Examiner of the telephonic interview of August 18, 2005 between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney. As understood, and as stated in the Response to Interview Summary filed September 26, 2005, the Examiner was to conduct another search of the prior art and would allow the claims if no prior art was found that was better than the art then of record. The Examiner in the Office Action of October 24, 2005 cited the Ishihara patent as the secondary reference to van Ketwich. In the present Office Action, Ishihara has been withdrawn, and Bisset has been newly cited as the secondary reference to van Ketwich. Yet, Bisset is ineffective as a secondary reference because its touch surface 312 is on the bottom surface 310. No mention is made of placing the touch surface on an edge side of the device. Motivation based on Bisset does not exist for moving the touch surface of van Ketwich to the edge side.

Thus, it is submitted Bisset is no better than the art of record before the Examiner at the time of the aforesaid interview. In accordance with the Examiner's procedure, this application ought now to be allowed. This application was filed on November 5, 2001, and no claim has been amended since the Reply to Office Action dated

August 30, 2004. All claims ought now to be allowed promptly with no further intrusion on the twenty-year term.

With regard to the specific rejections in the present Office Action, the Examiner states on page 2, paragraph 3, that in van Ketwich the touch surface is arranged on the edge side of the apparatus and is curved in a first direction to convex shape. As has been stated by applicant in earlier replies, the touch screens are arranged on the front side of van Ketwich and not on any of the four edge sides. Thus, there is no motivation in either van Ketwich or Bisset (as pointed out above) for moving the touch surface of van Ketwich to an edge side of the apparatus. The van Ketwich apparatus still remains without a touch surface on an edge side.

On page 3, paragraph 3, of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to and discusses the Kamada patent. None of the rejections in the present Office Action was based on the Kamada patent. The Kamada patent was combined with van Ketwich in the Office Action of December 13, 2004, but, as understood, was subsequently dropped as a reference by the Examiner. Accordingly, no reply is being made to the portion of the Office Action relating to Kamada.

The remaining assertions based on van Ketwich and the tertiary references of Armstrong and Zenk, both of record, have been answered in previous responses to prior Office Actions. Furthermore, Armstrong and Zenk fail to correct the deficiencies of Bisset for the same reasons previously advanced that these references failed to correct the deficiencies of van Ketwich/Ishihara and van Ketwich/Kamada employed in earlier Office Actions. Applicant especially incorporates by reference herein, and without limitation, the reasons and arguments advanced in the Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2004 and the Request for Reconsideration of June 7, 2005. The responses

also show that the art cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest that "placement of the touch surface is a matter of routine design choice." (See Office Action, page 6, paragraph 14.)

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-19 are earnestly solicited.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this Reply and charge any required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.


Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 18, 2006

By:

Tipton D. Jennings  
Reg. No. 20,645

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tipton D. Jennings". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Tipton" and "D. Jennings" being more distinct parts.